



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

CHOI, Jung Mu et al.

Group Art Unit: 2687

Appln. No. 10/667,929

Filed: 22 September 2003

Examiner: Dung Lam

For: METHOD FOR ENHANCED POWER SAVING ON DCF BASED WIRELESS
NETWORKS

* * * * *

DECLARATION UNDER 37 CFR SECTION 1.137(b)(1)

The Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

I, Muriel Chider, being duly sworn, state that I am the Office Manager of the Law Offices of Royal W. Craig of which the managing partner, Royal W. Craig, is the attorney prosecuting the above-captioned case. I further declare and state the following.

1. The subject application became abandoned for failure to respond to the Official Action dated 01 July 2005.
2. Said failure to respond resulted from inadvertently misplacing a facsimile letter dated 22 September 2005 with instructions from Applicant's Korea attorneys to proceed with a response to the Official Action dated 01 July 2005.
3. Applicant's Korea law firm Nobel International Patent & Law Firm apparently sent the undersigned law firm a letter dated 22 September 2005, with instructions to proceed with

a response to the outstanding Official Action. This facsimile must have been mis-docketed and misfiled by our office because it has disappeared without a trace. I have personally searched our existing file and all other potential files and have not yet discovered where Nobel's 22 September 2005 letter was placed, and the instructions were never docketed. Thus, our office thought that there were no instructions. Rather than timely responding to the outstanding official action as instructed, we continued instead to prompt the Korea law firm Nobel for instructions. Eventually, on January 25, 2006 Nobel faxed us a copy of their earlier letter to our office dated 22 September 2005 by which they had already authorized us to proceed. This copy bore our own date stamp showing receipt (and was apparently a confirmation copy that we faxed back to Nobel to confirm receipt). Of course, at this point it was too late to respond, and so the attorney Royal W. Craig immediately prepared and filed this Petition to Revive based on unintentional abandonment under 37 C.F.R. 1.137(b).

* * * * *


While it is believed that precautions were taken which should have avoided the circumstances, which caused the abandonment, the inadvertent misplacement of client's facsimile dated 22 September 2005 with instructions to respond to the Official Action dated 01 July 2005 led to unintentional failure to respond.

I declare that all statements made of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true.

I further declare that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false

statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or by both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the above-referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,



Muriel Chider, Ph.D.
(410) 385-2383

Date 16 February 2006

Law Offices of Royal W. Craig
Suite 153
10 N. Calvert St.
Baltimore, MD 21202